



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/934,582

08/23/2001

Doreen D. Jiang

782.1115

7884

21171

7590

08/10/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

SUITE 700

1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CORRIELUS, JEAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/10/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/934,582

Applicant(s)

JIANG ET AL.

Examiner

Jean M. Corrielus

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed on June 6, 2007, in which claims 1-28 are presented for further examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 6, 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-25 recite "automatically updating a shared central subscriber directory used over a network by different autonomous telephony messaging systems to route subscriber messages". However, the body of the claim does not perform what is set forth in the preamble.

Art Unit: 2162

The body of the claim mentions about automatically updating corresponding voice messaging subscriber information in the shared central subscriber directory based on the update request, which is totally different from the limitations recite in the preamble. Applicant is advised to amend the claim to link the limitation from the preamble to the body of the claims.

Claim 26 recites method for controlling a computer to generating an update request responsive to a voice messaging. The body of the claim has nothing to do with controlling a computer to generating an update request responsive to a voice messaging. Amendment to the claim is advised.

Finally, claim 28 recites updating a shared directory used by telephone messaging system. No such limitation is described in the body of the claim. Amendment is greatly advised.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2162

8. Claims 1-21 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reformato US patent no. 6,741,677 in view of Eshleman et al. (hereinafter "Eshleman") US patent no. 7,162,467.

As to claim 1, Reformato discloses the claimed "generating an update request in response to an event that changes voice messaging subscriber information in a subscriber database of a voice messaging system based on a determination that said event is one of predetermined events requiring an update across the telephony messaging systems" (updating the database to reflect the change information; col.14, lines 23-32; and "when the update request is generated, automatically updating corresponding voice messaging subscriber information in the shared central subscriber directory based on the update request, where the updated voice messaging subscriber information becomes accessible by the different autonomous telephony messaging (systems to route subscriber voice messages" (a plurality of different telephone network coupled to a central office to which subscriber is connected is dynamically controlled, in response to IP status information, thereby enable a subscriber automatic access to voice mail services implemented on multiple different telephony messaging system (col.4, lines 20-22; col.14, lines 25-36 and lines 52-62). However, Reformato does not explicitly disclose the step of appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis. On the other hand, Eshleman discloses the claimed feature "appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis"(as using a simple FIFO (First In First Out) queue to hold the update requests, and when each update request is processed, both steps are completed before de-queuing the request, wherein all read and write requests to the Cache database and to the DBMS server will conform

Art Unit: 2162

to the required serializable transaction isolation level, see col.15, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Reformato' system by appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Eshleman. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use such a modification for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the application server by reducing the network traffic.

As to claim 2, Reformato discloses, "storing the update event at an intermediate server while maintaining synchronicity between the update event and the messaging system" (col.14, lines 52-61).

As to claim 3, Reformato discloses the claimed "wherein said generating occurs only when information changed in a message box has corresponding information in the shared central subscriber directory" (col.14, lines 25-35).

As to claim 4, Reformato discloses the claimed "sending the update request from the intermediate server to a proxy client that in turn sends the update request to the central subscriber directory" (col.17, lines 18-20).

Art Unit: 2162

As to claim 5, Reformato discloses the claimed “wherein said generating and updating is performed by a plurality of messaging systems that also access the shared central subscriber directory” (updating the voice messaging information, col.14, lines 24-35).

As to claim 6, Reformato discloses the claimed “wherein said generating is responsive to a change to a message box initiated by a subscriber telephone call” (col.18, lines 3-15).

As to claims 7-21:

The limitations of claims 7-21 have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-6 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 23, Reformato discloses the claimed “automatically updating a voice messaging subscriber directory used to route subscriber messages across different autonomous telephony voice messaging systems and comprising a telephone number field, a local access and transport area identifier field, a network routing address field, and a presentation address field, where said updating is based on a determination that at least one of predetermined voice messaging related events requiring an update across different autonomous telephony voice messaging systems has occurred” (updating the voice messaging system coming from a plurality of vendors, col.36-38; col.17, lines 58-col.18, line 10). However, Reformato does not explicitly disclose the step of appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis. On the other hand, Eshleman discloses the claimed feature “appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the

Art Unit: 2162

queue on a first-in first-out basis”(as using a simple FIFO (First In First Out) queue to hold the update requests, and when each update request is processed, both steps are completed before dequeuing the request, wherein all read and write requests to the Cache database and to the DBMS server will conform to the required serializable transaction isolation level, see col.15, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Reformato’ system by appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Eshleman. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use such a modification for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the application server by reducing the network traffic.

As to claim 24, Reformato discloses the claimed “a control unit generating an update request in response to an event that changes voice messaging subscriber information in a subscriber database of one of the voice messaging systems, the update request being generated based on a determination that the event is one of predetermined events requiring an update across the telephony voice messaging systems” (updating the voice messaging information, col.14, lines 24-35); and “a database comprising the subscriber directory, where the database is updated by said control unit based on the update request when the update request is generated, whereby the changed voice messaging subscriber information becomes accessible to each of the different autonomous telephony voice messaging systems to route subscriber voice messages” (updating the voice messaging system coming from a plurality of vendors, col.36-38; col.17, lines 58-col.18, line 10). However, Reformato does not explicitly disclose the step of appending the

Art Unit: 2162

update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis. On the other hand, Eshleman discloses the claimed feature “appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis”(as using a simple FIFO (First In First Out) queue to hold the update requests, and when each update request is processed, both steps are completed before de-queuing the request, wherein all read and write requests to the Cache database and to the DBMS server will conform to the required serializable transaction isolation level, see col.15, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Reformato’ system by appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Eshleman. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use such a modification for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the application server by reducing the network traffic.

As to claims 25-26, Reformato discloses the claimed “generating an update request responsive to a voice messaging subscriber information change event in any of plural voice messaging subscriber information databases of respective autonomous voice messaging systems in response to a determination that said event is one of predetermined events requiring an update across the voice messaging systems” updating the voice messaging information, col.14, lines 24-35) and “updating a shared centralized subscriber directory used across the autonomous voice messaging systems to route subscriber voice messages among the plural message systems” (updating the

Art Unit: 2162

voice messaging system coming from a plurality of vendors, col.36-38; col.17, lines 58-col.18, line 10).

As to claim 27, Reformato discloses the claimed “automatically updating voice messaging subscriber information of corresponding subscriber databases of the telephony messaging systems and the shared subscriber directory in response to a predetermined voice messaging subscriber information change event at any one of the telephony messaging systems” (updating the voice messaging information, col.14, lines 24-35); and “synchronizing corresponding routing directories of each of the telephony messaging systems in accordance with predetermined voice messaging subscriber information change event, where the telephony messages systems are maintained by multiple vendors” (updating the voice messaging system coming from a plurality of vendors, col.36-38; col.17, lines 58-col.18, line 10). However, Reformato does not explicitly disclose the step of appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis. On the other hand, Eshleman discloses the claimed feature “appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis”(as using a simple FIFO (First In First Out) queue to hold the update requests, and when each update request is processed, both steps are completed before de-queuing the request, wherein all read and write requests to the Cache database and to the DBMS server will conform to the required serializable transaction isolation level, see col.15, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Reformato’ system by appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in

Art Unit: 2162

first-out, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Eshleman. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use such a modification for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the application server by reducing the network traffic.

As to claim 28, Reformato discloses the claimed “receiving a request for changing voice messaging subscriber information from a updating the voice messaging subscriber information across each of the telephony messaging systems” (updating the voice messaging information, col.14, lines 24-35); and “routing a voice message to a second of the telephony systems using the updated voice messaging subscriber information” (updating the voice messaging system coming from a plurality of vendors, col.36-38; col.17, lines 58-col.18, line 10). However, Reformato does not explicitly disclose the step of appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis. On the other hand, Eshleman discloses the claimed feature “appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out basis”(as using a simple FIFO (First In First Out) queue to hold the update requests, and when each update request is processed, both steps are completed before de-queuing the request, wherein all read and write requests to the Cache database and to the DBMS server will conform to the required serializable transaction isolation level, see col.15, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Reformato’ system by appending the update request generated to a queue and reading each update request from the queue on a first-in first-out, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Eshleman. One

Art Unit: 2162

having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use such a modification for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the application server by reducing the network traffic.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 22 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (571) 272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2162

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jean M Corrielus
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162

August 6, 2007